

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/817,507	04/02/2004	M.K. Manoj Babu	9244-12	3161
	90 01/29/2007 SIBLEY & SAJOVEC	•	EXAMINER	
PO BOX 37428	BOX 37428 CARTER, K		ENDRA D	
RALEIGH, NC 2	7627		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1617	
	·		•	•
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
31 DA'	YS	01/29/2007	PAPER	

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/817,507	BABU ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kendra D. Carter	1617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence ac	Idress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 36(a). In no event, however, may a re will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT c, cause the application to become ABA	ATION.  ply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this candoned (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 A</u>	pril 2004.		
<u> </u>	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		ers, prosecution as to the	e merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E		• •	
Disposition of Claims		·	
4) Claim(s) is/are pending in the application	on.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) 1-32 are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.		
Application Papers	•		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	ar		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		v the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• •	·	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			FR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached	Office Action or form P7	ГО-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		·	•
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority document		•	•
2. Certified copies of the priority document			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	eceived in this National	Stage
application from the International Bureau			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not r	eceived.	
Attachment(s)		·	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ımmary (PTO-413) /Mail Date	
2)		formal Patent Application	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	_·	

Application/Control Number: 10/817,507 Page 2

Art Unit: 1617

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-11, 13-24, and 29-32, are drawn to a composition comprising a fluoroquinolone active agent, a steroidal or non-steroidal anti-inflammatory agent, and a soluble polymer, classified in class 424, subclass 78.04 for example.
- II. Claims 12, and 25-28, are drawn to a method of treating a bacterial infection and applying a topical formulation to the eye, classified in class 514, subclasses 58 and 171+, for example.

Inventions of Group I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the composition can further comprise an antifungal agent and be used to treat bacterial and fungal infections on the skin.

Application/Control Number: 10/817,507

Art Unit: 1617

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. It is noted that while the searches of Group I and II may be overlapping, there is no reason to believe that the searches would be coextensive. In searching Group I, Examiner will be focusing on the patentability of the composition itself, and not the method of treatment or application of Group II.

Conversely, in searching Group II, Examiner will be focusing on the patentability of method of treatment and application and not the composition itself.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not

Application/Control Number: 10/817,507

Art Unit: 1617

semmensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the

Art Unit: 1617

record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

A telephone call was made to Kennith Sibley on January 17, 2007 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made because Mr. Sibley requested a written restriction.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kendra D. Carter whose telephone number is (571) 272-9034. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/817,507 Page 6

Art Unit: 1617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**KDC** 

SPEENI PADMANABHAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER